



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,629	07/03/2003	Deanna Lynn Quigg Brown	AUS920030412US1	7818
35525	7590	08/27/2007		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER HUSSAIN, TAUQIR	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/614,629	Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner Tauqir Hussain	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/03/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to amendment /reconsideration filed on 06/08/2007, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 3-5,7,10-12,14-15,17,18-19 has been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.

2. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, and rejection has been maintained from previous office action, further details are give in response to argument section.

Examiner respectfully, maintains the rejection under 35 U.S.C 101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As explained in the previous office action according to the specification cited on page 20, includes radio frequency and light wave transmission with in the scope to computer readable media. Examiner suggest with the current office standing light waves and radio frequency's are not patentable subject matter and above mentioned subject matter does not fall into one of the four statutory subject matter namely, process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, and therefore appropriate correction is required in the specification.

3. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, has been withdrawn as applicant's argument deemed persuasive.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 8, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: means for translation of addresses and means for sending the translation back to the requester.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1,8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hutchison et al. (Patent No.: US 7,249,191 B1), hereinafter "Hutchison".

8. As to claims 1,8 and 15, Hutchison discloses, receiving a request for host information for a remote computer from a requestor (Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where client 104 sends out a request to DNS) wherein the request includes one of a host name or an Internet Protocol address and is received from the requester (Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where client request includes an IP address);

identifying a media access control address and a subnet mask using the request (Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where client asking MAC address against an IP address and gateway responding with sending a MAC address means there is identifying means for identifying MAC address against an IP address); and

returning a response to the requester, wherein the response includes the media access control address and the subnet mask ((Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where gateway responds with MAC address, it is inherent that subnet mask will be there along with MAC address or else packet will be loss not knowing which network or which segment of the network it belongs to, further the MAC address has a corresponding IP address and IP address has its subnet mask to specify the sub network or network segmentation).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2, 9 and 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison in view of Bullman et al. (Pub. No.: Us 2002/0162038 A1), hereinafter "Bullman".

10. As to claims 2,9 and 16, Hutchison discloses the invention substantially as in parent claims 1,8 and 15, including, wherein the requester generates a packet using the host information and sends the packet to the remote computer (Hutchison, Col.4, lines 16-21). However, Hutchison is silent on using wake-up logic in the packet. Bullman however, teaches, generating a wake-up packet and transmitting it to remote computer to wake-up all the sleeping component of the computer (Bullman, [0017, lines 1-12]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison as applied to claim 1,8 and 15 above with the teachings of Bullman in order to an obvious advantage to reuse existing well-defined network components such a MAC devices and drivers from a technical reuse and from cost perspective.

1. Claims 3,6,7,10,13,14,17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison as applied to claim 1,8 and 15 above, in view of Harrison et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0177133 A1), hereinafter "Harrison".

2. As to claims 3,10 and 17, Hutchison discloses the invention substantially as their parent claims. However, Hutchison is silent on, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are received from a dynamic host configuration protocol server and are stored in a data processing system for the data processing system. However, Harrison teaches, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are received from a dynamic host configuration protocol server and are stored in the data processing system (Harrison, [0148], where DHCP keeps the updated SME database with the MAC and IP addresses of the CPE which upon terminal request forwards it to bridge DHCP Server). Examiner also takes the official notice that DHCP is a well know network device and can be used in all kind of network setup as the setup requirement and further MAC address has a corresponding IP address therefore, there is a subnet mask associated with it, further DNS is the data processing system which stores all the records).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison with the teachings of Harrison in order to patch up security holes in the network that could enable users from one class to access system that they are not authorized to access.

3. As to claims 6,13 and 20, Hutchison discloses the invention substantially as their parent claims 1,8 and 15, including, wherein the data processing system is a domain name server (Hutchison, Fig.7, Element-106, Col.4, lines 13-15, where DNS server returns the IP address for webpages.com).

4. As to claims 7 and 14, Hutchison discloses the invention substantially as their parent claims 1 and 8. However, Hutchison is silent on, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are stored together in a record for both a name-to-address file and an address-to-name file. However, Harrison teaches, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are stored together in a record for both a name-to-address file and an address-to-name file (Harrison, [0191, lines 1-7], where DNS is disclosed to carry out the mapping information from IP to MAC or MAC to IP and domain name to IP etc.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison with the teachings of Harrison in order to patch up security holes in the network that could enable users from one class to access system that they are not authorized to access.

5. Claims 4,11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison as applied to claims 1,8 and 15 above, in view of Matsuda et al. (Patent No.: US 7039688 B2), hereinafter "Matsuda".

6. As to claims 4,11 and 18, Hutchison discloses the invention substantially as their parent claims 1, 8 and 15. However, Hutchison is silent on, wherein the dynamic host configuration protocol server obtains the media access control address and the subnet mask from a remote computer when the remote computer requests an address from the

Art Unit: 2152

dynamic host configuration protocol server. However, Matsuda teaches, wherein the dynamic host configuration protocol server obtains the media access control address and the subnet mask from a remote computer when the remote computer requests an address from the dynamic host configuration protocol server (Matsuda, Fig.7, Element-704, Col.12, lines 46-52 and Col.12, lines 66-67 and Col.13, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison with the teachings of Matsuda in order to avoid conflict between home appliances in a home network and further to have the inventory listing of home appliances through DHCP table.

7. Claims 5,12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison as applied to claim 1,8 and 15 above, in view of Bahl (Patent No.: US 6,957,276 B1), hereinafter "Bahl".

8. As to claims 5,12 and 19 Hutchison discloses, the invention substantially as in parent claims 1, 8 and 15. However, Hutchison is silent on, wherein the media access control address and the subnet are received from a user submitting the media access control address and the subnet mask and are stored in a data processing system for the data processing system. However, Bahl teaches, wherein the media access control address and the subnet are received from a user submitting the media access control address and the subnet mask and are stored in a data processing system for the data processing system (Bahl, Col.9, lines 1-9, where DHCP is a data processing system)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison with the teachings of Bahl in order to reduce the broadcast on LAN by allowing DHCP server to issue a static IP address for infinite time (Bahl, Abstract).

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references, as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tauqir Hussain whose telephone number is 571-270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571 272 3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TH



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
8/19/7